

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 16, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims. Claims 57-60 and 76-87 are currently pending.

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Augustine for the courteous and productive interview conducted with Applicant's in-house counsel, Ms. Chang, and the undersigned outside representative. During the course of the interview, the foregoing amendments to the claims were discussed, and at the conclusion of the interview Examiner Augustine indicated that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record.

Claim 57 pertains to a user interface in which windows can have positions that obscure desktop objects in a first view. The claim recites that, in response to a user command, the windows are moved from their obscuring positions into a second, or desktop, view, so that at least a part of the desktop obscured by the one or more windows is exposed. For example, one or more of the desktop objects obscured by the windows in the first view are exposed and made visible on the desktop. While this latter view is being displayed, an object on the desktop is selected. The windows are then returned to their original positions in the first view, while the object remains selected, and the object is then placed in one of the windows in the first view. This aspect of the disclosed subject matter is depicted in the sequence of steps illustrated in Figures 19a-19d of the application. Claim 60 is directed to the converse situation, in which an object in a window is selected, the windows are removed from their obscuring positions while the object remains selected, and the

object is placed on the desktop. This feature is illustrated in Figures 20a-20d.

Independent claim 83 is generic to both of these modes of operation.

During the course of the above-noted interview, Examiner Augustine agreed that the DeStefano patent (US 6,075,531) and the Bronson patent (US 5,305,435), whether considered individually or in combination, do not disclose a user interface in which an object can be selected during the display of one of the first or second views as described above, the display is switched to the other of the two views while the object remains selected, and the object is then placed on a desktop or in a window after the display has switched to the other of the two views.

The DeStefano patent was relied upon as teaching the display of one or more windows such that the windows can obscure a user's view of objects on the desktop of a user interface. However, the DeStefano patent does not disclose the remaining features discussed above that are recited in the claims.

The Bronson patent discloses a user interface in which windows can be "pushed" off the visible area of a display screen. When this occurs, a tab is displayed along the edge of the screen, adjacent the virtual location of the window. To return the window to the display area, the user drags the tab, or double clicks on it. However, the Bronson patent does not disclose the ability to select an object in one of these two views, and maintain the selection of the object while switching to the other of the two views, to thereafter place the object in a window or on the desktop while in the second one of the two views.

Furthermore, as discussed at the interview, there is no reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Bronson patent with the DeStefano patent. In the user interface of the Bronson patent, the windows are completely pushed off the

display screen, so that they are no longer visible to the user. In contrast, the user interface of the DeStefano patent is concerned with the user's ability to resize or reposition multiple windows that are displayed on the screen. It does not function to remove windows from the display area. Thus, at all times, the windows remain visible within the display area. The teachings of the Bronson patent, regarding the pushing of windows completely off the screen, would have no utility in this context. As such, there is no reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references in the manner suggested in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims recite subject matter that is patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the pending claims, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 13, 2009

By: /James A. LaBarre/
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620